

WO

1

2

3

4

5

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Anthony Camboni,

Plaintiff,

V.

Mark Brnovich, et al.,

## Defendants.

No. CV-15-02538-PHX-JAT

## ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Anthony Camboni's Motion to Strike and Motion for a More Definite Statement. (Doc. 42). Having read Plaintiff's filing, the Court understands it to be a response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Joinder in State Bar of Arizona's Motion to Dismiss, (Doc. 28), as well as a motion seeking independent relief pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e),(f).

To the extent that Plaintiff's filing serves as a response to Defendants' motion to dismiss, (Doc. 28), it is stricken for failing to comply with the Local Rules of Civil Procedure. LRCiv. 7.2(e)(1) mandates that “[u]nless otherwise permitted by the Court,” Plaintiff's response to Defendants' motion “may not exceed seventeen (17) pages.” Plaintiff has not sought leave from the Court to file a response in excess of the allotted page limit. Accordingly, the Court strikes Plaintiff's filing to the extent that it serves as a response to Defendants' motion to dismiss.

Plaintiff's filing also, however, appears to request independent relief pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12. Plaintiff seeks to strike Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Joinder in

1 State Bar of Arizona's Motion to Dismiss, (Doc. 42 at 3), or—in the alternative—seeks a  
 2 more definite statement. (*Id.* at 2). Both avenues of requested relief relate to the  
 3 representation of certain Defendants by counsel Brian Bergin. Plaintiff asserts that Mr.  
 4 Bergin "has produced no facts, evidence, or testimony" that would prove "Attorney  
 5 Bergin represents the aforementioned Defendants." (*Id.*). Thus, according to Plaintiff,  
 6 Defendants' motion to dismiss should be stricken. The Court disagrees. Plaintiff has cited  
 7 nothing suggesting that Defendants cannot obtain counsel to represent them in this  
 8 matter. Moreover, Plaintiff has cited nothing to suggest that counsel's Notice of  
 9 Appearance and Waiver of Service, (Doc. 6), filed on January 8, 2016, is somehow  
 10 defective or insufficient. The Court notes that this is not the first time Plaintiff has  
 11 attacked Mr. Bergin's representation of Defendants. The Court's March 17, 2016, Order  
 12 rejected Plaintiff's unsupported argument that Mr. Bergin had failed to present sufficient  
 13 facts "concerning his representation" (Doc. 18 at 3 n.3). Plaintiff, here, again attacks Mr.  
 14 Bergin's representation without any evidence to support his position. The Court rejects  
 15 Plaintiff's conclusory argument, and absent some form of supporting evidence, the Court  
 16 will not entertain this argument in the future. Plaintiff's Motion to Strike and Motion for  
 17 a More Definite Statement, (Doc. 42), are both denied.

18 Plaintiff has asked the Court to set a hearing for oral argument on the  
 19 aforementioned issues. (Doc. 42 at 3). The Court will deny this request. Plaintiff has  
 20 submitted a memorandum discussing the law and facts in support of his position, and oral  
 21 argument will not aide the Court's decisional process. *See e.g., Partridge v. Reich*, 141  
 22 F.3d 920, 926 (9th Cir. 1998); *Lake at Las Vegas Investors Group, Inc. v. Pacific Dev.*  
 23 *Malibu Corp.*, 933 F.2d 724, 729 (9th Cir. 1991). Moreover, Plaintiff will be given the  
 24 opportunity to re-file a compliant response to Defendants' motion to dismiss.

25 Plaintiff has through the end of Friday, May 27, 2016, to file a response to  
 26 Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Joinder in State Bar of Arizona's Motion to Dismiss,  
 27 (Doc. 28), that is compliant with this District's Local Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court  
 28 reminds Plaintiff that his response may not exceed seventeen (17) pages, LRCiv.

1       7.2(e)(1), and notifies Plaintiff that this will be the last opportunity to file a response to  
2 the pending Motion to Dismiss that complies with the Local Rules. Failure to “conform  
3 in all substantial respects with the requirements of this Local Rule” will be deemed to be  
4 consent to the “granting of the motion and the Court may dispose of the motion  
5 summarily.” LRCiv. 7.2(i).

6                  For the aforementioned reasons,

7                  **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s filing, (Doc. 42), is **STRICKEN**, to the extent  
8 that the filing serves as a response to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss and Joinder in State  
9 Bar of Arizona’s Motion to Dismiss. (Doc. 28).

10                 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s filing, (Doc. 42), is **DENIED**, to  
11 the extent that it seeks a more definite statement or to strike Defendants’ motion to  
12 dismiss pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12.

13                 Dated this 17th day of May, 2016.

14  
15  
16  
17                   
18                 James A. Teilborg  
19                 Senior United States District Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28